UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,587	02/27/2004	Young C. Yoon	4740-240	7781
24112 COATS & BEN	7590 05/30/200 NNETT, PLLC	EXAMINER		
1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300			BHATTACHARYA, SAM	
Cary, NC 27518			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/789,587	YOON ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sam Bhattacharya	2617
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to divide apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)☑ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)☑ Th 3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, p	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	rawn from consideration. /or election requirement. ner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document copies of the priority document all Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date

Application/Control Number: 10/789,587 Page 2

Art Unit: 2617

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Amico et al. (US 5,606,729) in view of Tsujita (US 6,078,822).

Regarding claims 1 and 49, D'Amico discloses a system and method of measuring noise at one or more base stations 116 in a mobile communication system (see FIG. 1), including defining a periodic silence period for at least one carrier that is independent of reverse link channel frame boundaries; transmitting silence parameters that define the periodic silence period to mobile stations communicating with the base stations. See col. 1, line 55 – col. 2, line 12.

D'Amico fails to disclose that the mobile stations 122 stop transmitting during the periodic silence periodic silence periodic silence periods. However, Tsujita discloses these features in FIG. 14 and col. 14, line 61 – col. 15, line 34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify D'Amico by incorporating these teachings of Tsujita for the purpose of ensuring that an accurate mearurement of the noise is obtained.

Regarding claims 2, D'Amico discloses that the silence parameters include a frequency parameter that indicates the frequency of the silence period, a duration parameter that indicates

Page 3

Art Unit: 2617

the duration of the silence period, and a time reference parameter that provides an absolute time reference for synchronizing silence periods for non-synchronous reverse link channels. See col. 6, lines 1-19.

Regarding claims 3, D'Amico discloses that the periodic silence period encompasses portions of at least two consecutive reverse link frames. See col. 6, lines 27-42.

Regarding claims 4, D'Amico discloses that measuring the noise at each base station during the periodic silence periods includes measuring the power of the noise during the periodic silence period. See col. 5, lines 2-17.

Regarding claims 5, D'Amico discloses that the noise includes adjacent carrier interference. See col. 7, lines 10-25.

Regarding claims 6, D'Amico discloses that the mobile communication system is a multicarrier system and wherein the periodic silence period is defined for at least one carrier. See col. 5, lines 55-67.

Regarding claims 7, D'Amico discloses including assigning a first group of mobile stations to a first carrier with a periodic silence period; and assigning a second group of mobile stations to a second carrier without a periodic silence period. See col. 8, lines 7-24.

Regarding claims 8, D'Amico discloses that the periodic silence period is defined for a plurality of carriers. See col. 8, lines 25-39.

Regarding claims 9, D'Amico discloses that the periodic silence period is synchronized for two or more carriers. See col. 1, line 55 – col. 2, line 12.

Regarding claims 10, D'Amico discloses that the periodic silence period is defined for all carriers. See col. 8, lines 25-39.

Regarding claims 11, D'Amico discloses that the periodic silence period is synchronized for all carriers. See col. 1, line 55 – col. 2, line 12.

Regarding claims 12, D'Amico discloses including causing legacy mobile stations that do not recognize silence periods to stop transmitting on the reverse link during a silence period. See col. 9, lines 10-27.

Regarding claims 13 and 53, D'Amico discloses that causing legacy mobile stations that do not recognize silence periods to stop transmitting on the reverse link during a silence period includes directing the legacy mobile stations to a dummy carrier during the silence period. See col. 9, lines 10-37.

Regarding claims 14 and 54, D'Amico discloses that causing legacy mobile stations that do not recognize silence periods to stop transmitting on the reverse link during a silence period includes directing the legacy mobile stations to perform a candidate frequency search on a different carrier during the silence period. See col. 9, lines 39-52.

Regarding claims 15 and 55, D'Amico discloses that the duration of the silence period is at least one frame. See col. 8, lines 7-24.

Regarding claims 16, D'Amico discloses that the duration of the silence period is less than one frame. See col. 8, lines 25-39.

Regarding claims 17, D'Amico discloses including suspending transmission of power control commands on a forward link power control channel during the silence period. See col. 1, line 55 – col. 2, line 12.

Claims 18-34 correspond to claims 1-17, respectively, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as those claims.

Claims 35-41 correspond to claims 1-3 and 15-17, respectively, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as those claims.

Claims 42-48 correspond to claims 1, 3-6, 15 and 16, respectively, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as those claims.

Regarding claims 50 and 56, D'Amico discloses that controlling a transmitter responsive to the determination whether a frame overlaps a silence period includes transmitting a first part of the frame; suspending transmission of the frame during the silence period, and transmitting a second part of the frame following the silence period. See col. 9, lines 10-24.

Regarding claims 51 and 57, D'Amico discloses that controlling a transmitter responsive to the determination whether a frame overlaps a silence period includes delaying transmission of a frame if the frame overlaps a silence period, and transmitting the delayed frame following the silence period. See col. 12, lines 14-33.

Regarding claims 52 and 58, D'Amico discloses that controlling a transmitter responsive to the determination whether a frame overlaps a silence period includes erasing a frame if the frame overlaps a silence period. See col. 12, lines 34-56.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Page 6

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sam Bhattacharya whose telephone number is (571) 272-7917.

The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, George Eng can be reached on (571) 272-7495. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sb

/Sam Bhattacharya/

Examiner, Art Unit 2617